



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

mw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,101	06/15/2001	Jack B. Strong	21495-05944	7948

758 7590 09/22/2006

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHUOC H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/883,101	STRONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuoc H. Nguyen	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24 and 26-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24 and 26-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Referring to page 4 of claims, claim 25 is missing. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 22-24, 26, 30, 31, and 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zarom U.S. Patent 6,356,529. 27-29, 32, and 33

Re claim 22, Zarom discloses a method of providing web content to a wireless device (Figure 2), comprising: receiving at a proxy server (e.g. HTML Filter Server 36 and WAP Proxy Server 34 is considered to be a proxy server) a first portion of data for a web page, transforming the received first portion of the web page data for display by a web browsing program of the wireless computing device, sending the transformed first portion of the web page data to the wireless computing device, and receiving at the proxy server a second portion of the web page data after the sending of the transformed first portion of the web page data (e.g. col. 3 lines 7-37; col. 5 lines 51-63; col. 8 lines 30-40; and col. 9 lines 14-27).

Re claim 23, Zarom further discloses transforming the received second portion of the web page data for display by the web browsing program, and sending the transformed second portion of the web page data to the wireless computing device (e.g. col. 8 lines 30-40; and col. 9 lines 14-27).

Re claim 24, Zarom further discloses compressing (inherently) the received first portion of the web page data (Figure 2).

Re claim 26, Zarom further discloses converting the received first portion of the web page data from HTML to WML (e.g. col. 8 lines 30-40).

Re claim 30, Zarom further discloses reformatting the received first portion of the web page data (e.g. col. 3 lines 20-37).

Re claim 31, Zarom further discloses determining a type of the received first portion the web page data, wherein the transforming is dependent on the type (e.g. the data received from the web server is in the HTML format and transform it to the second format such as WML, e.g. col. 8 lines 30-40).

Re claim 34, it is an apparatus of claim 22. Thus claim 34 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 22.

Re claim 35, it is an apparatus of claim 23. Thus claim 35 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 23.

Re claim 36, Zarom's figure 2 further discloses the first portion of the web page data is received from a web content provider (e.g. web server 32) operatively connected to the apparatus (e.g. HTML filter server 32 and WAP proxy server 32).

Re claim 37, it is system of claim 22. Thus claim 37 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 22.

Re claim 38, Zarom further discloses the wireless computing device (e.g. wireless communication device 26) has a web browser arranged to progressively render web page data received from the proxy server (e.g. HTML Filter Server 36 and WAP Proxy Server 34 is considered to be a proxy server, col. 3 lines 7-37; col. 5 lines 51-63; col. 8 lines 30-40; and col. 9 lines 14-27).

Re claim 39, it is a system of claim 23. Thus claim 39 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Re claims 27-29, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarom in view of Jamtgaard et al. (Hereafter, Jamtgaard) U.S. Patent 6,430,624).

Re claims 27-29, Zarom discloses a method for converting the received first portion of the web page data from first type of network protocol to the second type of network protocol such as HTML to VML (e.g. col. 8 lines 30-40); however, Zarom does not explicitly teach converting from HTML to HDML, PQA, or XHTML.

Art Unit: 2143

Jamtgaard teaches a method for converting the web page data from HTML to HDML, PQA, or XHTML (col. 2 lines 50-59).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Jamtgaard's teaching into Zarom's method to converting the web page data from HTML to HDML, PQA, or XHTML in order to provide the optimal formatted for display on the devices according to the input/output format, such as the display screen size of the devices (e.g. col. 2 lines 50-59).

Re claim 32, Zarom discloses determining a type of data receive and transforming data to a different format based on the data type the received first portion the web page data, wherein the transforming is dependent on the type (e.g. Abstract; and col. 8 lines 30-40). However, Zarom fails to teach determining a type of the web browsing program, wherein the transforming is dependent on the type.

Jamtgaard teaches determining a type of the web browsing program, wherein the transforming is dependent on the type (e.g. col. 7 2nd paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Jamtgaard's teaching into Zarom's method for determining the type of browsing program and transforming is dependent on the type in order to web page information can be translated into a data format appropriate for and recognizable by the destination information appliance (e.g. col. 7 lines 20-26).

Re claim 33, Zarom fails to teach determining a size of a display screen of the wireless computing device, and determining at least one preference set by a user of the wireless computing device, wherein the transforming is dependent on at least one of the size and the at least one preference. Jamtgaard teaches determining a size of a display screen of the wireless computing device, and determining at least one preference set by a user of the wireless computing device, wherein the transforming is dependent on at least one of the size and the at least one preference (e.g. col. 2 lines 48-59; and col. 3 lines 66 through col. 4 1st paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Jamtgaard's teaching into Zarom's method for transforming the web page data is dependent on a size of a display screen and the at least one preference in order to permits content in a variety of different formats and content can be displayed on many different information appliances and devices having different screen sizes (e.g. col. 4 2nd paragraph).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2143

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phuoc H Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

September 13, 2006


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISOR, EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER